

**Minutes**  
**COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE**  
**Meeting of November 14, 2019**

**Present:** Vilashini Cooppan, Thorne Lay, Grant McGuire (Chair), Nico Orlandi, Jennifer Parker, Su-hua Wang, Judith Aissen (*ex officio*), Jaden Silva-Espinoza (ASO)

**Consultation – iCP/EVC**

*Healthcare*

CFW consulted with Interim Campus Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor (iCP/EVC) Lori Kletzer on the topics of healthcare access (PAMF) and faculty housing. After brief introductions, Chair McGuire informed iCP/EVC Kletzer that for the first time since its creation, the premiums for UC Care will not go up in 2020. However the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) Healthcare Task Force (HCTF) is concerned about the future of the plan. Chair McGuire shared that there have been consistent concerns regarding access to the Palo Alto Medical Foundation (PAMF), which is included in the UCCare plan and CFW is concerned about how the campus will retain its access to PAMF providers if the plan goes under.

iCP/EVC Kletzer agreed with CFW's concern and noted that she has been involved in the UCSC healthcare access conversation for more than 25 years and stated that UCSC is in a healthcare limited market. She added that we are at a critical moment due to changes in insurance along with the impact of cost of housing and the inability for medical foundations to hire physicians. PAMF cannot hire enough practitioners and access is limited. She noted that for most employees, UCCare is the only access point for PAMF, and the plan is not stable. iCP/EVC Kletzer stated that she refused to accept that healthcare is an intractable problem. She questioned how the campus could get to a better place of advocacy for what is essentially a systemwide issue, and suggested that in order to do better, UCSC needs to advocate for its specific and unique healthcare, access, and location issues.

ICP/EVC Kletzer noted that she understands the urgency and complexity of the situation, but added that much of healthcare falls under the benefits purview of the Vice Chancellor for Business and Administrative Services, Sarah Latham, who is part of a systemwide healthcare group. When asked how we can know how we have advocated for our campus in the past in order to determine what hasn't worked, iCP/EVC Kletzer suggested that she could speak with her team and the VCBAS and her team.

Members noted that there is a need for the UCSC voice on associated systemwide task forces and suggested that because the task forces are focused on the main issues, they forget about campus differences and individual needs. iCP/EVC Kletzer added that turnover on these task forces also leads them to do the same thing over and over again. Chair McGuire noted that the HCTF is looking to revise its charge and suggested that UCSC and UC Santa Barbara need campus representatives on the committee in order to keep an eye on campus needs.

When asked if she knew anything about Kaiser's plans for the future and whether it will one day be a serious option for campus employees, iCP/EVC Kletzer stated that she hadn't seen anything recently about their hospital plans and believes it will take some time. She added that they may not have financial incentives to build a hospital that is closer to campus than the current hospital in Watsonville.

The iCP/EVC noted that there was a discussion of the need to diversify UC Care at a recent Council of EVCs meeting. The expressed need was for UC Care to be healthier in order for UC Medical to be healthier, which with no access to a medical center is a no starter for UCSC. However, the Council discussed how the plan needs to find younger healthier enrollees in order to be more sustainable and a suggestion was made that individual campuses could take responsibility for this. iCP/EVC Kletzer informed her colleagues that UCSC would have an interest in doing so.

When asked if UCSC could have its own medical plan for PAMF in order to bypass the “death spiral” of UC Care, iCP/EVC suggested that this must have been explored in the past. Members noted that there may be a precedent with the Western Health Advantage plan that was created for UC Davis. Chair McGuire noted that PAMF wanted to speak with our campus about a possible plan in 2018, but later cancelled the meeting for unknown reasons. iCP/EVC Kletzer asked for more information regarding this meeting and noted that she would speak with the Senate Chair, VCBAS Latham, and the Chancellor. She was not aware that PAMF had reached out to our campus and added that perhaps there is something that may be done in this regard.

### *Housing*

CFW shared that VCBAS Latham and Associate Vice Chancellor for Physical Planning, Development, and Operations Traci Ferdolage met with the committee in Spring 2019 to discuss plans for Ranch View Terrace Phase II (RVT2), and noted that they were preparing for a market demand survey, which was to be sent out in fall 2019. CFW has provided a high level of feedback both on the survey, and timeline.

iCP/EVC Kletzer shared that all of the members of the Employee Housing Group have been appointed and the first meeting will be held on December 17, 2019, during which, they will review the final version of the demand analysis survey with the goal of launching and wrapping up the analysis by spring quarter. The goal is to then quickly develop plans for RVT2.

The iCP/EVC stated that the demand analysis is an important programmatic piece to employee housing. With the environmental impact studies done, there is less worry about litigation and more worry about confidence in the building project. iCP/EVC Kletzer emphasized that the campus is not building for yesterday, but for the future, and suggested that there will likely be a balance of town home, apartment, and single family living much like Cardiff Terrace.

Members noted that the campus will never be able to build enough housing to satisfy needs, and noted that rental units should be considered in addition to purchase units as new faculty are also having difficulty finding rentals. Members also emphasized the need for the next housing phase and/or program to include incentives to increase turnover. iCP/EVC Kletzer shared that she lives in faculty housing and thinks about turnover all the time. She noted that some of the townhouses were meant to be starter homes, but since owners don't build equity, and owners are therefore unable to move out. The iCP/EVC added that employees are able to stay in housing even when they retire. She noted that she respects this, but from an organizational level, noted that it tamps

down on the dynamics of employee housing. She added that she didn't think that owners should be kicked out when they retire, but suggested that we need a way to look at this as an institution, and other campuses are doing things differently. Chair McGuire shared that CFW has considered that it might be time to rethink the Employee Housing RePricing Program. The iCP/EVC agreed that it may be time to think about it.

When asked if owners who have purchased housing could be required to leave, iCP/EVC Kletzer replied that some campuses do this, but she does not know how. She added that our campus also has complicated financing and ground leases, noting that owners on Dickens Way are on 30 year leases, and suggested that this should be looked at.

Chair McGuire noted that UC Irvine (UCI) is creating retiree housing, which has smaller units. However, UCI has more land to build. iCP/EVC Kletzer noted that it was interesting that UCI is thinking of the whole portfolio from new faculty to emeriti.

iCP/EVC Kletzer acknowledged that in the last year, there has been some discussion about possibly moving the Student Housing West project to the site reserved for RVT2. She emphasized that this space should be reserved for RVT2, noting that moving the Student Housing West project there would just make one problem worse by attempting to solve another problem. Members noted that RVT2 would barely meet the current demand. When asked what the next stage of development would be, iCP/EVC noted that building on the UCSC campus is difficult. When asked about how realistic additional building sites noted in the new Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) were, iCP/EVC replied that it is good to note the need for additional faculty housing, and preliminarily map out areas for faculty housing on the updated LRDP. She added that there is more discussion at the chancellor level about shared equity, faculty recruitment, and loans, and reported that the EVCs have joined together to encourage the Office of the President (UCOP) to think of assistance beyond faculty recruitment allowances.

Members shared that recruitment allowances are problematic as they are left up to the dean, are taxable, and many faculty did not know that housing allowances existed when they were recruited. iCP/EVC Kletzer agreed and said that due to being taxed, the net amount is not that much. She shared that UC Berkeley is looking to forgivable loans and is pushing shared equity, but UCOP is stating that forgivable loans and shared equity is not possible. Chair McGuire noted that UCFW has considered both forgivable loans and shared equity and is keen to push forward on forgivable loans, but sees shared equity as a negative.

### *Partner Hires*

Members noted that just like housing concerns, partner hire issues also lead to retention actions. iCP/EVC Kletzer noted that former CP/EVC Tromp has drafted a proposal for a forward funding model for partner hires and has sent the proposal to the Senate for review. Much like Presidential Post Docs, the plan would provide divisions with up to five years of funding for partner hires and would then need to identify and provision and plan for paying for the hire. Salary, start up, etc.,

would have the same cost sharing as other hiring. The goal is to take the unanticipated piece out of partner hires and provide time to plan. Chair McGuire noted that CFW had not been invited to opine on the proposal and will ask that CFW be included in the review.

When members noted that some campuses have a central pot of money for partner hires, the iCP/EVC replied that she is the central pot of money at UCSC, and emphasized that the forward funding proposal basically says that the CP/EVC Office will fund for five years and then the divisions need to figure it out. Her hope is that divisions will take control and figure out joint ways to fund FTEs in the future. She added that there is a question of when does the campus make a partner hire offer, before or after a retention issue arises, noting that it can be more expensive if we wait until a retention issue arises, and then there is a real threat of losing the faculty member. The iCP/EVC shared that she agrees with both options and feels the campus needs to be responsive to both needs. She added that there is room in the program's consultation with the Senate to weigh in on this question as well.

### **Consultation Debrief**

Members debriefed from their consultation with iCP/EVC Kletzer. Members questioned whether some campus employee housing could be turned back into rental units, and whether the current 10% maximum capacity of staff in employee housing may be changed, noting that difficulty in hiring staff support amidst the current housing crisis. Chair McGuire questioned whether there might be a way for UCSC to create a separate pathway to PAMF and noted that it would be good to plan ahead before the expected demise of the UC Care plan. CFW would like to continue its conversation of healthcare and housing with a consultation with VCBAS Latham.

### **Divisional Review – Proposed Revisions – CAPM 514.286, LSOE Series**

CFW has been invited to provide feedback on proposed revisions to CAPM 514.265 – Lecturer with Security of Employment Series. The proposed revisions are said to be a result of changes to the series in the Academic Personnel Manual (APM) effective 01/01/18. Substantial changes have been proposed. Although CFW applauds the attempt to create standard criteria for evaluation, members raised concerns about how the new criteria will be evaluated. The committee trusts that the campus will come up with an equitable process for LSOE review and will recommend that this process be revisited and re-evaluated in six years' time in order to ensure that equity has been established.